

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-40, 42, 43, 45, 46, 48, 49, 51, and 52 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 12, 13, 15-17, 23-25, 31-34, 40, 42, 43, 46, 48, 49, 51-59, 63, 64, and 68 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) based on Park et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,392,348). Claims 2-11, 14, 18-22, 26-30, 35-39, 60-62, and 65-67 were objected to. Independent claims 1, 17, 25, 32, 34, 40, 58, 63, and 68 are being amended. Dependent Claims 36 and 60 are also being amended. Claims 2, 18, 26, 35, 41, 44, 47, 50, 59, and 64 are being cancelled. Claims 69-92 are being added. No new matter is being introduced.

Claim 1 is being amended to include the limitations of Claim 2 (“subbands of 0-1 kHz and 1-2 kHz”). Independent claims 17, 25, 32, 34, 40, 58, and 63 are being amended to include limitations of respective ‘objected to’ dependent claims similar to Claim 2 (i.e., Claims 18, 26, 35, 41, 44, 47, 50, 59, and 64). Claim 68 is being amended to include the same limitation. Accordingly, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) are now moot and Applicants respectfully request that the independent claims be allowed.

Similarly, Claims 3-11, 14, 19-22, 27-30, 36-39, 60-62, and 65-67 that were objected to for depending from a rejected independent claim should now be allowed in view of the amended independent claims. Likewise, Claims 12, 13, 15, 16, 23, 24, 31, 33, 42, 43, 46, 48, 49, and 51-57 that were rejected for depending from a rejected independent claim should now also be allowed.

Claim 36 is being amended to insert the word—medium—between “computer-readable” and “of Claim 34” to correct an inadvertent omission. Claim 60 is being amended to include similar language as independent Claim 58 from which Claim 60 depends (“rate change splitting”).

Claim 3 was objected to at page 3 of the present Office Action but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of base Claim 1. New independent Claim 69 includes all the limitations of independent Claim 1 and dependent Claim 3 (“splitting the electrical signal into the subbands comprises filtering the electrical signal using a power symmetric infinite impulse response (PS-IIR) filter”) and, therefore, should be in condition for allowance. Similarly, new independent claims 73, 77, 81, 85, and 89 include all the limitations of independent Claims 17, 25, 34, 58, and 63 and respective dependent Claims 19, 27, 36, 60, and 65, which include the same or similar limitations as Claim 3. Accordingly, Applicants

respectfully submit that new independent Claims 73, 77, 81, 85, and 89 should also be in condition for allowance.

New Claims 70-72, 74-76, 78-80, 82-84, 86-88, and 90-92 depend from the new independent Claims; therefore, these Claims should also be in condition for allowance.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that the claims that will be pending after entry of the Claim Listing (Claims 1, 3-17, 19-25, 27-34, 36-40, 42, 43, 45, 46, 48, 49, 51-58, 60-63, and 65-92) are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By Mark B. Solomon  
Mark B. Solomon  
Registration No. 44,348  
Telephone: (978) 341-0036  
Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133

Dated: 8/13/04